

CLOSED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARGE AUDIENCE DISPLAY SYSTEMS, LLC,)	CASE NO. CV 11-3398-R
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'
)	MOTION FOR ATTORNEYS' FEES,
)	COSTS, AND EXPENSES
v.)	
)	
TENNMAN PRODUCTIONS, LLC, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Before the Court is Defendants' Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and Expenses, which was filed on June 30, 2015. (Dkt. No. 223). Having been thoroughly briefed by both parties, this Court took the matter under submission on August 11, 2015. (Dkt. No. 245).

A court may award attorneys' fees to a prevailing party in a patent dispute "in exceptional cases." Title 35 U.S.C. § 285. A prevailing party establishes its right for consideration of entitlement to an award of attorneys' fees in an exceptional case by a preponderance of the evidence. *Octane Fitness, LLC v. ICON Health & Fitness, Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 1749, 1758 (2014) ("*Octane*").

The Supreme Court recently explained that "an 'exceptional' case is simply one that stands

1 out from others with respect to the substantive strength of a party’s litigating position (considering
 2 both the governing law and the facts of the case) or the unreasonable manner in which the case
 3 was litigated.” *Id.* at 1756. This is a departure from the Federal Circuit’s earlier “rigid and
 4 mechanical formulation” of the test for what constitutes an exceptional case. *Id.* at 1754
 5 (discussing *Brooks Furniture Mfg. v. Dutailier Int’l, Inc.*, 393 F.3d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2005)).

6 A district court makes a determination of whether a case is exceptional “in the case-by-
 7 case exercise of their discretion, considering the totality of the circumstances.” *Id.* at 1756
 8 (footnote omitted). Factors that a district court may consider include, but are not limited to,
 9 ““frivolousness, motivation, objective unreasonableness (both in the factual and legal components
 10 of the case) and the need in particular circumstances to advance considerations of compensation
 11 and deterrence.”” *Id.* at 1756 n.6 (quoting *Fogerty v. Fantasy, Inc.*, 510 U.S. 517, 534 n.19
 12 (1994)). Such a determination lies squarely within a district court’s discretion. *See Highmark v.*
 13 *Allcare Health Mgmt. Sys., Inc.*, 134 S. Ct. 1744, 1748 (“For reasons we explain in *Octane*, the
 14 determination whether a case is ‘exceptional’ under § 285 is a matter of discretion.”) It is properly
 15 within a district court’s discretion because “the district court ‘is better positioned’ to decide
 16 whether a case is exceptional.” *Id.* (quoting, in part, *Pierce v. Underwood*, 487 U.S. 552, 559-60
 17 (1987)).

18 The Ninth Circuit requires that attorney fees be awarded by first calculating the
 19 “Lodestar.” *Caudle v. Bristow Optical Co.*, 224 F.3d 1014, 1028 (9th Cir. 2000). The “Lodestar”
 20 is determined by multiplying the number of hours reasonably expended by the prevailing party on
 21 the litigation by the reasonable hourly rate. *Morales v. City of San Rafael*, 96 F.3d 359, 363 (9th
 22 Cir. 1996). The reasonable hourly rate is determined by the prevailing market rate in the
 23 community for comparable services. *Bell v. Clackamas County*, 341 F.3d 858, 868 (9th Cir.
 24 2003). After the Lodestar is computed, the court must assess whether additional considerations
 25 require adjusting the figure. *Morales, supra*, 96 F.3d at 363-364. A strong presumption exists that
 26 the Lodestar is a representation of a reasonable fee. *G&G Fire Sprinklers, Inc. v. Bradshaw*, 136
 27 F.3d 587, 600 (9th Cir. 1998), *vacated on other grounds*, 526 U.S. 1061 (1999).

28 Under this approach, the court calculates a “lodestar” figure by “multiplying the number of

1 hours reasonably expended on the litigation times a reasonable hourly rate.” *Blum v. Stenson*, 465
2 U.S. 886, 888 (1984) (citation omitted); *see also Cunningham v. County of Los Angeles*, 879 F.2d
3 481, 484 (9th Cir. 1988). The lodestar figure is presumptively reasonable. *City of Burlington v.*
4 *Dague*, 505 U.S. 557, 562 (1992). In certain circumstances, a court may also adjust the award
5 upward beyond the lodestar to take into account special factors. *Blum*, 465 U.S. at 897.

6 The instant case is sufficiently extraordinary to warrant an award of attorneys’ fees, costs,
7 and expenses. Plaintiff, an apparent shell corporation, seems to have been formed with the sole
8 intent to create jurisdiction in another district. In light of the terms’ use in the patent itself, the
9 definitions Plaintiff proffered to the United States Patent & Trademark Office (“USPTO”) seem
10 disingenuous at the very least.

11 It also seems that Plaintiffs further prolonged the reexamination process, and consequently
12 this litigation, by refusing to present the USPTO with additional prior art that, eventually, was
13 dispositive of the claims at issue in this case. Ultimately, every one of Plaintiff’s asserted patent
14 claims were held invalid. Unperturbed, Plaintiff sought to reopen the underlying litigation to
15 engage in discovery to attempt to assert additional claims, despite having had multiple previous
16 opportunities to assert such claims.

17 Finally, in its most recent opposition to the instant motion, Plaintiff violated clear,
18 important canons of professionalism in proffering clearly privileged information in support of its
19 argument to mitigate or minimize its liability for attorneys’ fees. In offering what was clearly an
20 inadvertently sent attorney-client privileged communication, Plaintiff underscored the types of
21 actions it has taken in this case.

22 Having now endured six years, it is clear that Plaintiff was the driving force behind
23 keeping this litigation and reexamination process alive. Plaintiff’s litigation tactics have cost both
24 Defendants and this Court to expend time and resources regarding the resolution of what appears
25 to have been a frivolous claim. Defendants are entitled to fees for defending the entirety of this
26 action.

27 Defendants seek a total award of \$755,925.86, comprised of \$733,414.34 in attorneys’ fees
28 and \$22,511.52 in costs and expenses. A review of the submitted attorneys’ fees and costs and

1 supporting evidence therefor demonstrates that they are reasonable. These totals are in accord
2 with the costs of defending a patent infringement suit as they are lower than the average cost to
3 defend against patent infringement suits in which as little as less than \$1 million is at stake,
4 according to a 2013 Report of the Economic Survey. (*See* Dkt. No. 224-25). Such attorneys' fees
5 are also reasonable given the six year period over which they were accrued and in light of the
6 voracious and frivolous litigation of this case. Defendants are entitled to an award of all their
7 sought attorneys' fees, costs, and expenses.

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** Defendants' Motion for Attorneys' Fees, Costs, and
9 Expenses in the total amount of \$755,925.86, is GRANTED. (Dkt. No. 223).

10 Dated: August 18, 2015.



11
12
13 MANUEL L. REAL
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28